

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **I. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract**

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar. The amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into a substitute specification and abstract. Attached are two versions of the substitute specification and abstract, a marked-up version showing the revisions, as well as a clean version. No new matter has been added.

### **II. Informalities**

Claim 27 was objected to in view of various informalities identified on page 2 of the Office Action. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested since claim 27 has been amended to resolve the problems identified by the Examiner.

### **III. Amendments to the Claims**

Claims 12, 23, 31, 32, 35 and 36 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Further, independent claims 1, 15 and 29, 30, 33 and 34 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to overcome the rejections discussed below.

It is also noted that claims 1-11, 13-22, 24-30, 33 and 34 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

#### **IV. 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections**

Claims 1-26, 33, 34 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failure to recite statutory subject matter. Specifically, independent claims 1, 15, 33 and 34 were rejected for merely encompassing an abstract idea of calculating a prime candidate N and for not producing a physical transformation or establishing a practical application. This 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 15, 33 and 34 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 15, 33 and 34 have been amended to clarify the practical application of the claimed invention and to recite additional limitations directed to more than just calculating the prime candidate N. Specifically, the independent claims have been amended to recite (i) the generation and output of a public key of an RSA encryption system for a terminal, wherein the public key is generated using a prime N obtained from the calculated prime candidate N, (ii) the generation and output of a private key of the RSA encryption system for the terminal, wherein the private key is generated using the prime N. Additionally, the independent

claims have been amended to clarify that the claimed invention is directed to a key issuing server and/or a key verification server.

Furthermore, Applicants note that the claims 27 and 28 of the present application have **NOT** been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 or in view of any prior art. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 27, which is directed to a system including a key issuing server apparatus and a key verification server apparatus, does in fact recite an invention directed to statutory subject matter. Independent claims 1, 15, 33 and 34 have been amended, as mentioned above, to recite features similar to the features recited in the system of claim 27. As a result, since claim 27 recites statutory subject matter, and because claims 1, 15, 33 and 34 have been amended to recite limitations similar to claim 27, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 15, 33 and 34 now recite statutory subject matter.

Therefore, withdrawal of this portion of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 30, 32, 34 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failing to recite an invention that falls within one of the four statutory categories. Specifically, claims 30, 32, 34 and 36 were rejected for reciting a program which can be interpreted as software alone. As mentioned above, claims 32 and 36 have been cancelled. Therefore, this rejection is considered moot in regard to claims 32 and 36.

Further, claims 30 and 34 have been amended to recite a computer-readable recording medium having a program recorded thereon, wherein the program causes a computer to execute a method. As a result, withdrawal of this portion of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is respectfully

requested, since claims 30 and 34 are now directed to statutory subject matter.

Moreover, claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for reciting a method that is not tied to a specific machine or for not transforming the underlying subject matter. Claim 29 has been amended to clarify that the method is tied to a particular apparatus. As a result, claim 29 now recites statutory subject matter. Therefore, withdrawal of this portion of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is respectfully requested.

## **V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yuichi FUTA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

2009.08.31 13:50:06 -04'00'

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Andrew L. Dunlap  
Registration No. 60,554  
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
August 31, 2009